IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT APPLICATION OF:)	Electronically Filed on November 9, 2007
Horsnell, et al.)	
SERIAL NO.: 10/521,686)	
FILED: September 19, 2005	
FOR: Printing Device And Method Using) Valve Control	
ART UNIT: 2853	
EXAMINER: Uhlenhake, Jason S.	
Confirmation No. 2174	

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Reply Brief responds to the Examiner's Answer mailed October 24, 2007. The Applicants respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the final rejection of claims 1-4 of the present application.

REMARKS

Initially, the Applicants note that the arguments in the Examiner's Answer are essentially the same (indeed, almost identical) as those found in the Final Office Action. *Compare* February 26, 2007 Office Action at pages 2-5 and Examiner's Answer at pages 3-9 (particularly, pages 3-7). The Applicants have already refuted these arguments. *See* Appeal Brief at pages 6-13, in particular. The Applicants note in passing, however, that the Examiner's Answer does perfunctorily add a citation with respect to a motivation to combine the references (*see*, *e.g.*, Examiner's Answer at page 5), in contrast to the Final Office Action.

The Examiner's Answer offers an additional citation from Peer as allegedly disclosing the relevant limitations. In particular, the Examiner's Answer cites Figure 5 of Peer as disclosing "sequentially reading one or more print data sub-elements from the memory locations associated with one pre-determined time period." *See* Examiner's Answer at pages 6-7.

The Applicants submit, however, that the Examiner's Answer mischaracterizes the Applicants argument. As shown in the Appeal Brief, the Applicants demonstrate that the proposed combination of references does not describe, teach or suggest "sequentially reading one or more print data sub-elements from the memory locations associated with one pre-determined time period" and "repeating" the sequentially reading step "for a subsequent pre-determined time period for each pulse generated by the pulse generating means." See Appeal Brief, e.g., at pages 6-8.

Moreover, Figure 5 "is a block diagram" that shows a ROM, microprocessor, RAM, drive pulse generator and other components. *See* Peer at Figure 5. The Applicants respectfully submit, however that there is nothing in Figure 5, nor the discussion related to Figure 5, that describes, teaches or suggests "sequentially reading one or more print data sub-elements from the

memory locations associated with one pre-determined time period" and "repeating" the

sequentially reading step "for a subsequent pre-determined time period for each pulse

generated by the pulse generating means," as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

The Examiner's Answer attempts to gloss over the fact the neither Slomianny, nor Peer

describe, teach or suggest "repeating" the sequentially reading step "for a subsequent pre-

determined time period for each pulse generated by the pulse generating means," by

summarily concluding "the language 'pre-determined time period' is broad." See Examiner's

Answer at pages 7 and 9. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that such a conclusory

statement is not an appropriate substitute for a limitation that is clearly not found in the cited

references.

The Examiner's Answer primarily relies on Figure 6 of Peer as disclosing the "repeating"

step noted above. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that there simply is nothing in

this flow chart, or its associated description, that describes, teaches or suggests "repeating" the

sequentially reading step "for a subsequent pre-determined time period for each pulse

generated by the pulse generating means." See Appeal Brief at pages 10-11.

For at least the reasons discussed in the Appeal Brief and above, the Applicants

respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable in all respects. Therefore, the Board is

respectfully requested to reverse the rejections of pending claims 1-4.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2007

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.

500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor

/Joseph M. Butscher/

Joseph M. Butscher

Registration No. 48,326

Chicago, Illinois 60661 Telephone:

(312) 775-8000

Facsimile:

(312) 775-8100

3